DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 102 FL 000 179

By-Agard, Frederick B.; And Others

A Survey of Language Classes in the Army Specialized Training Program.

Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y. Commission on Trends in Education.
Pub Date 44
Note-35p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.85
Descriptors-Adult Students, *Audiolingual Methods, Audiolingual Skills, *Curriculum Evaluation, Faculty Organizations, Fles Programs, Grammar, *Language and Area Centers, Language Instruction, Language Programs, Language Skills, *Military Training, *National Surveys, Program Descriptions, Program Design, Program Effectiveness, Secondary Schools, Special Programs, Teacher Education
Identifiers-Army Specialized Training Program, ASTP

A survey, involving visits to the 44 institutions offering the Army Specialized Training Program's (ASTP) Foreign Area and Language Study Curriculum, provides information on program structure, faculty organization, student requirements, instructional procedures for presenting language skills and grammar, instructional aids, and the result achieved by the, then, innovative audiolingual teaching practices. Preceding the discussion of the study and its findings, there are references to survey organization and procedures as well as acknowledgments of those assisting in the project. The final portion is comprised of (1) a glossary of relevant acronyms, (2) a list of recommendations expressed by survey leaders and participants, (3) the possibilities for applying ASTP teaching practices to FLES and secondary school language programs, and (4) an explanation of projected teacher training needs. (AF)

ED031102

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A SURVEY OF LANGUAGE CLASSES
in the
ARMY SPECIALIZED TRAINING PROGRAM

The Report of a Special Committee

FL 000 179

Prepared for

THE COMMISSION ON TRENDS IN EDUCATION
of The Modern Language Association of America
100 Washington Square, New York 3, N. Y.

MEMBERS OF THE
COMMISSION ON TRENDS IN EDUCATION

Appointed by the Executive Council of
The Modern Language Association of America

TERMS EXPIRING IN 1946

BAYARD QUINCY MORGAN, Stanford University
FRANKLYN BLISS SNYDER, Northwestern University
ROBERT E. SPILLER, Swarthmore College

TERMS EXPIRING IN 1945

I. L. KANDEL, Teachers College, Columbia University
THOMAS CLARK POLLOCK, New York University
HORATIO SMITH, Columbia University

TERMS EXPIRING IN 1944

WILLIAM CLYDE DEVANE, Yale University
HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE (*Chairman* and *Secretary*)
The George Washington University
EDWIN H. ZEYDEL, University of Cincinnati

A SURVEY OF LANGUAGE CLASSES
in the
ARMY SPECIALIZED TRAINING PROGRAM

Prepared for

THE COMMISSION ON TRENDS IN EDUCATION
of The Modern Language Association of America

By

FREDERICK B. AGARD, *Princeton University*
ROBERT J. CLEMENTS, *Harvard University*
WILLIAM S. HENDRIX, *Ohio State University*
ELTON HOCKING, *Northwestern University*
STEPHEN L. PITCHER, *St. Louis Public Schools*
ALBERT VAN EERDEN, *Princeton University*
and
HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE, *The George Washington University*

COMMISSION ON TRENDS IN EDUCATION
New York, 1944

A SURVEY OF LANGUAGE CLASSES
in the
ARMY SPECIALIZED TRAINING PROGRAM

The entrance of the United States into the war brought with it many changes in the ways of living and thinking of the American people.

Schools, colleges, and universities began to feel the effect of these changes immediately after Pearl Harbor, and in the course of the next year our educational institutions generally had shifted over to war-time programs. Conspicuous among these changes were (1) a tremendously increased emphasis upon knowledge and skills needed by the Army and Navy, especially in mathematics, physics, engineering and other technical subjects, and in foreign languages; and (2) the establishment of educational programs intended to provide trained men for service in these fields within the shortest possible time. The extent of these changes is well known to the American public.

Popular interest in these programs has been widespread. This is especially true of the programs intended to make up as quickly as possible for our weakness as a nation in practical knowledge of foreign languages, which our far-flung military and naval operations quickly demonstrated to be vitally needed. The story of how educational personnel, and particularly specialists in foreign languages, responded to this call to service is an interesting one, and should some day be told in detail. We shall have to limit ourselves here to a brief description of the Army Language Training Programs.

What Are the Army Language Training Programs?

Early in the war, the General Staff of the United States Army became aware of the need for men with a working knowledge of the languages and peoples of regions in which it was likely that our forces would be operating. Such men were needed for duty in the Army Air Forces, Military Intelligence Service, Provost Marshal General's Office, Signal Corps, and in all arms of the Army Ground Forces. A common interest of these services and arms was that the officers or soldiers be able to speak one or more foreign languages, know the areas in which the languages are used, and have

insight into the elements which favor or endanger relations between the Army and the people with whom it comes in contact.

It was clear at the outset that the normal process of classification and assignment within the Army would not uncover a sufficient number of men with the proper language qualifications. A training program had to be set up. Consequently, a Foreign Area and Language Study Curriculum (FALSC) was speedily included in the initial planning of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP). This curriculum was based for the most part on the experience derived from the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies, a civilian training project which at that time had been in operation for two years. Since they may be of general interest, the objectives and recommended methodology of the language phase of the ASTP curriculum are reproduced here. It should be borne in mind that this curriculum was given as a general directive for instruction in all languages taught under the ASTP, including the Asiatic as well as the Western European languages.

The directive read, in part, as follows:

"*Specific Objectives*

The objective of the language instruction is to impart to the trainee a command of the colloquial *spoken* form of the language. This command includes the ability to speak the language fluently, accurately, and with an acceptable approximation to a native pronunciation. It also implies that the student will have a practically perfect auditory comprehension of the language as spoken by natives. Experience has shown that with the proper methodology the objective can be achieved in six to nine months.

Study of the system of orthography in which a language is normally written is not an objective *per se*. It is to be undertaken only to implement attainment of the above defined objectives. The time in the course at which written materials in the normal orthography of the language under study can be introduced will vary from language to language. It will be conditioned by the degree to which the system represents a phonemic transcription of the language, the degree to which the succession of written symbols represents the succession of significant sounds in speech. In Turkish and Hungarian, such materials can be used from the beginning; in Japanese and Chinese, only very late, if at all.

Methodology

War-time requirements necessitate that AST Language instruction be intensive in character. *However, this does not imply that the so-called "intensive method" must be used. Any methodology which will achieve the objective outlined above is acceptable.* Therefore, the following remarks are to be understood as suggestive, not prescriptive. Provision is made in the curriculum for fifteen contact hours of language study. These can be effectively used in accordance with the following plan:

a. One-hour demonstrations, three days a week, by the senior instructor of the course on the structure (pronunciation, grammar, syntax, word-formation, etc.) of the language;

b. Two-hour drill sessions, six days a week, in the presence of a drill-master who is a colloquial speaker of the language, preferably native-born. Work in drill sessions is under supervision of the senior instructor to assure that it is keyed to demonstrations on structure.

The demonstrations on the structure of the language should be so planned

that all the essential structural characteristics of the language will be presented during the course and in the order of difficulty which they constitute for the American learner. The supervised drill sessions should give the trainees intensive practice in the form of conversations which exemplify principles brought out in the immediately preceding demonstration on structure. They should further provide review drill on the material previously covered.

It is of crucial importance that the number of trainees in supervised drill sessions be kept small. In no case should the number exceed ten. In general, an instructional team will consist of:

a. One senior instructor for each assignment of eighty men;
b. Four drill-masters for each eighty men.

If the so-called "intensive method" is followed, the time of the senior instructor would be absorbed in offering the three demonstrations a week on structure, and in supervising the drill-masters. Each drill-master would handle the two two-hour sections of ten men each per day. The drill-masters need not be trained teachers; their chief function is to speak their own language. With very brief training, they can be taught to draw the men out and encourage them to practice on the limited materials with which they work in each session in accordance with the plan of the course. Care must be exercised to prevent the drill-masters from misinterpreting their function and assuming the role of teaching the structure of the language. This is properly taken care of in the demonstrations given by the senior instructor, and the drill sessions should be devoted entirely to practice. Where variants of this method are used the dominant emphasis should continue to be on the drill sessions.

This system of small, supervised drill sessions will enable institutions to arrange separate sections in accordance with the varying levels of linguistic acuity which will be found among trainees.

As far as practicable, men studying the same language should be housed and messed together and otherwise encouraged to talk the language they are studying."

The sentences here italicized show that the Army did not prescribe the methods to be used. Many institutions did not follow the methodology proposed.

Thus in the ASTP men were set to work learning to speak languages under conditions designed to give them at least ten hours a week of oral practice and three to five hours a week of formal instruction in the structure of the language studied. The length of the course was nine months. Trainees for the course were selected from non-commissioned men over twenty-two years of age, who had completed their basic military training and who qualified on three counts: (1) the Army General Classification Test (AGCT), an *intelligence and aptitude test; (2) demonstrated proficiency* in foreign languages; and (3) completion of at least one year of college work.

The first ASTP language course began in April, 1943. At the end of the year there were approximately 15,000 trainees studying languages under this system in fifty-five colleges and universities throughout the country.

Civil Affairs Training Schools (CATS) were set up by the Civil Affairs Division of the Provost Marshal General's Office. These were designed to give language and area training to officers commissioned from civilian life on the basis of their qualifications for service in the administration and rehabilitation of occupied

areas. Many studied under a language curriculum similar to that established by the ASTP. However, their training period was much shorter. Originally three or four months, it was finally reduced in most languages to eight weeks.

In contrast with the normal pre-war university language course aimed chiefly at the acquisition of reading skill, these new courses called for a much higher concentration of the student's time; preoccupation, at least in the initial stages, with the spoken form of the language; contact with native speakers of the language under study; and utilization of new material geared to the newly-oriented course.

Army authorities have expressed satisfaction at the results achieved under the AST program. Reports from the respective areas indicate that men trained under the program are rendering valuable service in the field.

How the Survey Originated

The unusual results obtained through this new approach to language learning led to considerable discussion. People asked, "Why isn't it possible to teach foreign languages in this way during normal times as well as in times of war?" Or, "If we can't follow this system completely, what aspects of it, if any, ought we to adopt in our post-war or civilian study of languages?"

At the same time some misunderstanding was created by popular articles about the system, which gave the impression that "magical" new methods had been discovered which materially lessened the time and effort required to master a foreign language. The considerable progress made in three months of hard, intensive work on a foreign language under this system was unfairly compared with the results of pre-war language study lasting several years, in spite of the fact that the actual amount of time invested in the new three-months' term usually exceeded the actual amount of time devoted to a foreign language in a course of two years under peace-time conditions. Nor was account taken of other factors, such as teacher-load—one teacher to ten or less students under the "new" system as contrasted with one teacher to twenty-five, thirty, or even thirty-five or forty students under the "old", or of the strong "motivation" supplied by the circumstances under which the ASTP was set up and operated.

Nevertheless, it was plain that advantage ought to be taken of whatever was novel and useful in the new programs. How to do this was a constant question in the minds of many foreign language specialists almost from the beginning of the new language programs, and it received concrete expression in the meetings of numerous organizations and groups concerned with foreign languages.

The particular project out of which the following report developed first took shape at the meeting of the Commission on Trends

in Education of the Modern Language Association of America held in New York City on November 6th and 7th, 1943, and attended by representatives not only of this Association, but also of the American Council of Learned Societies, whose financial support made the meeting possible. During the conference, Dr. William Berrien, Assistant Director for the Humanities of the Rockefeller Foundation, advanced a suggestion that had come to him from Professor Elton Hocking, of Northwestern University, that a group of specialists in foreign language teaching ought to make a careful survey, through personal visits, of institutions where new-type programs in foreign languages were under way, and report their impressions of these classes, particularly regarding ways in which the procedures followed could be adapted to the peace-time teaching of foreign languages. The Chairman of the Commission was authorized to seek financial support and make arrangements for such a survey. Shortly thereafter the Rockefeller Foundation generously agreed to make a grant of funds for the support of the project. A staff of six field representatives was selected, carefully chosen on the basis of competence in several foreign languages, successful experience as teachers, good judgment, and freedom from prejudice in favor of any particular method.

Organization and Procedure

The personnel of the survey project consisted of the following:

Director: Henry Grattan Doyle, *The George Washington University*

Survey Group:

Frederick B. Agard, *Princeton University*
Robert J. Clements, *Harvard University*
William S. Hendrix, *Ohio State University*
Elton Hocking, *Northwestern University*
Stephen L. Pitcher, *St. Louis Public Schools*
Albert van Eerden, *Princeton University*

Treasurer: Lyman R. Bradley, Treasurer, Modern Language Association of America

These staff members met in conference in New York for two days (February 16th and 17th, 1944) and adopted detailed plans for the conduct of the survey. They began work on the following day.

The speed with which the project was organized in detail and actual field work begun proved to be fortunate, for on February 18th the War Department announced the suspension, effective not later than April 1st, 1944, of most of the Army Specialized Training Program. In the six weeks between February 18th and the end of March, the field workers of the project visited a total of forty-four (of the fifty-five) institutions, including representative types of universities and colleges, distributed geographically as follows: New England States 7; Middle Atlantic States 17; South Atlantic States 1; North Central States 15; South Central States

4. Of the forty-four institutions, nine were visited by two members of the survey group, surveying jointly.

The following table indicates the distribution by languages of the institutions and classes visited:

Language	*Number of Institutions*	*Number of Classes*
German	31	106
French	26	89
Italian	19	50
Japanese	7	44
Spanish	14	40
Russian	11	34
Chinese	3	25
Finnish	2	10
Swedish	1	10
Burmese	1	4
Modern Greek	3	3
Turkish	3	3
Malayan	1	2
Bengali	1	2
Hindustani	1	2
Serbo-Croatian	1	2
Arabic	1	1
		427

The members of the survey group visited not only ASTP (Army Specialized Training Program) classes, but CATS (Civil Affairs Training Schools) classes as well, and in a few cases were able to visit and observe civilian classes also. Inasmuch as a separate survey of the "area" studies program was being conducted under the auspices of the Ethnogeographic Board, the members of the survey group confined themselves to observation of the language classes. In addition to visiting classes, however, they devoted a large amount of time outside of class hours to conferences with local directors of language programs, with teachers of the classes, with individual trainees, and with college and university administrators and faculty members, on every campus visited. This enabled them to gather direct evidence, based on their own observation, and indirect evidence, derived from the experience and impressions of a wide variety of local observers, as to the nature and effectiveness of the new programs, and the possibility of adapting them to civilian language instruction.

Careful planning characterized the project from the beginning. The members of the study group were carefully selected, so as to represent varying interests, length of service, personalities, and types of training and experience. Three of the six members of the group had had experience as directors or instructors in AST programs. The members of the group were together for two days before starting out on their assignments, and, after full discussion, drew up for their own guidance an organized chart or questionnaire

covering the points about which they were expected to inform themselves. Itineraries were so planned as to give each member of the survey group a variety of types of institutions to visit. In no case did anyone survey the classes in an institution of which he himself was a faculty member.

Acknowledgments

In every case the members of the survey group were cordially received. Every courtesy was extended and complete cooperation given. For this and for the interest everywhere manifested, the Commission and the members of the survey group are deeply grateful. They appreciate particularly the cooperation of the staff of the Army Specialized Training Division, and of the commanding officers of the Army units visited, who greatly facilitated the progress of the study in every way. The cooperation of Dr. J Milton Cowan, Director of the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies and Consultant to the Army Specialized Training Division, proved to be invaluable both in planning the survey and throughout its progress.

The survey group also had the moral support of the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers and of other language groups. Professor Robert Herndon Fife, of Columbia University, President of the Modern Language Association of America, and Chairman of the Committee on Modern Languages of the American Council on Education; Professor Percy Waldron Long, of New York University, Secretary of the Modern Language Association of America; and Dean William Clyde DeVane, of Yale University, Chairman of the Committee on Language Teaching of the American Council of Learned Societies, participated in the conferences which preceded and followed the survey and rendered invaluable aid through their advice and counsel.

The Commission is indebted to the institutions represented in the survey group for making available the services of their respective staff members. In every case leave with full pay was granted, which permitted the individuals concerned to participate in the survey without expense either to themselves or to the Commission for their services. For this important contribution to the project, the Commission extends its thanks to the respective institutions.

This report was written jointly by the six members of the survey group and the Chairman of the Commission on Trends in Education of the Modern Language Association of America, who directed the project, at a conference held at Atlantic City, N. J., on March 28, 29, 30, and 31, 1944, immediately following the completion of the field work of the survey. It represents their unanimous conclusions, based upon observations, regarding the results achieved in representative "new-type" language classes.

One of the most interesting elements of the AST Program was the complete novelty of the undertaking. On each campus a vast amount of organizing was necessary before the work could begin. Informed by the Army that a number of soldiers would arrive on certain dates, and with vague Army instructions, modern language departments were presented with a problem such as they never before had had to face. The Army prescribed fifteen hours a week of language work for each soldier, ten to twelve of these to be drill sessions in small groups with a native speaker in charge of each group. Whereas in normal times two or three teachers were able to handle the language work, now six or eight, and in one case twenty-five, additional people were needed, all native speakers. Had it not been for Hitler's policy toward minority groups, many of the demands made by the Army could scarcely have been met. As it was, institutions not located in or near metropolitan centers were frequently unable to find "natives" willing to accept positions as drill-master at a salary suggested by the Army. In some instances it was necessary to call upon trainees already fluent in a language to conduct drill sessions. The people who were engaged to conduct the drill sessions represented, without doubt, the most heterogeneous group ever assembled anywhere to teach languages. Besides some teachers of languages, there could be found economists, political scientists, lawyers, judges, poets, novelists, Army officers, school girls, housewives, barbers, a pearl diver, and even a former numbers-racket specialist. Many of the new drill-masters were seeing an American classroom for the first time. Yet, with competent supervision and guidance, most of them did very satisfactory work.

The organization of the teaching staffs followed in general a fairly uniform pattern. Each language had a senior instructor in charge who arranged and planned the program, prepared or supervised preparation of special material, taught the grammar classes, controlled the work of the drill-masters, and prepared and administered examinations and tests. At nearly all institutions the senior instructors were members of the regular teaching staff, often trained linguists, and usually not native speakers. In the case of several of the less common languages, such as Japanese, Chinese, Malayan, Russian, and the like, a native speaker was sometimes present in the classroom with the course director during presentation of the grammar.

At each institution a coordinator headed the program. With the course directors, numbering two to nine, the coordinator arranged schedules of classes and examinations and harmonized the work in area with the work in language instruction. The actual organization of each program was left more or less to the institution, with the result that some deviation from the procedure described above was observed in some units, especially in the ratio of grammar to

drill in the third term. Several units preferred a single language coordinator to supervise all languages, and there the instruction in all the languages followed one pattern. Such a plan generally resulted in increased efficiency and tighter control, and was therefore found very satisfactory.

In the vast majority of institutions each language taught had its individual supervising instructor, and the teaching methods and attainments varied from language to language. The results attained depended in large measure on the ability of the drill-masters, but by far the most important single factor in the pronounced success of many of the programs was the course supervisor. It was his assignment to synchronize the work in the grammar classes with the work in the drill sessions, which required constant supervision and control of the drill-masters, particularly during the first twelve weeks. At most institutions this work was being done very acceptably, but many exceptions to the rule were observed, and the committee feels compelled to stress the inherent dangers which almost invariably developed where little or no control of the drill-masters was exercised. The resulting waste or inefficient utilization of precious contact hours was considerable and naturally affected adversely the morale and attitude of the trainees, who realized that they were making little progress. Occasionally, too, senior instructors complained that they were not given authority to control the work of all of the drill-masters.

The drill-master was called upon to conduct from eighteen to twenty-four drill hours per week. In most institutions this meant that he was in charge of two conversation groups of five to ten trainees during each of their six two-hour drill sessions each week. Sometimes he would continue with the same groups throughout the term, but many institutions shifted drill-masters from one group to another.

It is obvious from statements of course directors that a great deal was expected of the drill-master. He was to serve as a model for the trainee, someone the latter could confidently imitate. He was to use only his native language, never English. In correcting errors he was to give only the correct usage, perhaps with appropriate analogies and generalizations, being careful to avoid accompanying his corrections with grammatical explanations (this was done in the language class by the supervising instructor). Particularly at first he was to confine himself to the vocabulary with which the trainee was familiar. Above all, he had to see to it that each person in the group had a chance to speak, and to be patient in the early stages, where the trainee's attempts at expression in the foreign idiom were bound to be awkward and halting. In the majority of institutions these conditions prevailed and the quality of work done was highly satisfactory.

Where the drill-master was left to shift for himself, he frequently pursued a course which retarded the students' progress. The most

common fault to which he yielded was that of completely dominating the conversation, of lecturing instead of directing the discussion. Sometimes the drill-master was observed displaying his knowledge of English. In one extreme case the entire procedure was reversed: the trainees were acting as drill-masters and the language used was English. In another case the trainees were spending the better part of a one-hour drill session writing idioms, which later were to be discussed, the drill-master spending this time reading a book. In one group visited the drill-master was asking a trainee to start talking, on any subject whatsoever, whether what he said made sense or not. "The important thing is that you talk," he concluded. Unfortunately, nothing worthy of mention seemed to occur to the boy and a substantial part of the hour was wasted. One drill-master was found using up class time declaiming poetry. This list could be extended, but it represents only isolated rather than general situations. Needless to add, the supervisor had not the faintest notion of these goings-on in the drill sessions. Clearly, the importance of close control cannot be overemphasized.

Of the two general objectives demanded by the Army, one, the ability to understand everything spoken by any native on any normal subject, was adequately satisfied by nearly every trainee. The vagueness of the other directive, that the trainee learn to speak the language with fluency and accuracy, created confusion, and was responsible for unsatisfactory work done in some of the programs, which set a goal far too easy to reach and presented no challenge to the trainee. When the trainee realized that not much work was expected of him he relaxed his efforts. On the other hand, where complete fluency was expected the results were eminently satisfactory. The work kept pace with the trainees' progress and the material discussed in drill sessions was not an insult to their intelligence. In these cases the drill-masters had an opportunity to give the trainees a part of their sometimes vast store of knowledge, and the drill-master frequently met the opportunity with carefully prepared and skillfully manipulated subjects for conversation so that both his and the trainees' interest and enthusiasm never flagged. In these programs the Army's demands were met most satisfactorily.

The screening of the trainees took place at STAR units, whence they were sent to one of the institutions offering area and language work. The men were not in all cases permitted to study the language of their own choice. An Army suggestion that men already proficient in one language be trained in a different one was not always followed. Hence many programs contained men ranging in degree of proficiency from those with complete fluency to raw beginners. The morale of some trainees was bad during the first term because they did not desire to study the language to which they had been assigned or did not desire to be in the program at all. Undoubtedly some trainees deliberately did badly so that they

might be separated from the program. Some institutions were unwilling or unable to have transferred to some other branch of the services the men who were not sufficiently gifted to meet the demands of the program. These men, if kept throughout the three terms, held back the vast majority of gifted trainees. Trainees who were already completely fluent also presented a problem in some institutions. Months sometimes passed before the Army assigned them to other duties.

Wherever trainees in any one language unit had had previous familiarity with the language, they were screened and then assigned to conversation groups ready to do more advanced work. The beginners were given frequent tests, as a result of which they were shifted into fast or slow sections. Frequent promotions and demotions were made to allow trainees to progress according to ability. The sectioning was generally very carefully done, one of the institutions providing twelve levels.

In general the men selected had definite linguistic aptitude and, in the opinion of the supervisors, were superior on the average to the students at representative universities and colleges. Most of the trainees displayed greater enthusiasm than is seen in regular classes. Only rarely did the trainee view his assignment as just another job to be done. In almost all of the units, observers agreed, the *esprit de corps* existing among both teachers and trainees had rarely been equalled.

Hearing and Speaking

Standing before a group of ten, the drill-master reads, at regular conversational speed, a dialogue of thirty-odd questions and answers. Many of the phrases are new to the students; so they listen attentively. To help them the drill-master dramatizes his reading by gestures, intonation, and facial expressions. After two or three such readings, the class begins to repeat in chorus, sentence by sentence. Then the printed version is passed out to the students, and the chorus work is repeated while all eyes follow the text. Ten minutes are given to this.

Now the class divides into two groups of five, each group forming a semi-circle and disregarding the other. The man at one end of his group puts the questions to his neighbor, who answers. Following this, the number two man puts the questions to number three, and so on. If anyone mispronounces, he is corrected by the others in his group, while the instructor listens alternately to the groups. About ten minutes are devoted to this.

Finally the men are told to stand up, to discard their papers, and to divide into five groups of two. The instructor has written on the blackboard a series of key words or phrases taken in sequence from the dialogues, and with these as their cues, the men

now begin five simultaneous dialogues in various parts of the room. To the casual visitor it sounds like bedlam, but this general uproar forces the men to listen attentively and to make their speaking loud and clear. The instructor moves about answering questions, listening, and occasionally reshuffling the groups. Midway in this exercise the key words are erased from the board and the men begin making variations on the dialogue, whose essential phrases are now memorized and automatic. Next day, the grammar—or rather "demonstration"—class is used for explaining the new forms and constructions which have just been learned. And the next day's drill class works on a new dialogue which repeats most of the recent forms and phrases, and adds new ones.

This unusual technique is only one of the various oral methods which have successfully capitalized on the general feeling that language is not merely something that we learn *about*, but that it is something which we *speak*. Frequently disregarded in peace-time teaching, this instinctive desire to speak a foreign language was given prominence when the ASTP directed that its language trainees should learn to understand and speak the colloquial language, but that the skills of reading and writing were, for its purpose, secondary.

The following enumeration of methods and devices is intended to give a composite picture of the most successful oral-aural procedures found in the ASTP language classes. The size and novelty of the program, the haste with which it was devised, and the inexperience of many of the teaching staff, were all a powerful stimulus to innovation. It was inevitable that some of the innovations should be unworkable or simply foolish, and a few of these shortcomings will be noted. However, most attention will be given to the successful features.

The useful devices and techniques were numerous and varied, but they were all based on imitation of a native speaker, and aimed at the gradual acquisition of a repertory of useful phrases and words. Constant mimicry to the point of memorizing (known as "mim-mem") has already been illustrated. Another oral technique had the student also write as he heard and pronounced. This dictation method was also successful, and had the advantage of a four-fold, instead of a three-fold attack. Sound and spelling were thus associated from the beginning.

The amount of formal grammar study varied with the tastes and habits of individual directors. Especially in the Western European languages, there was a tendency to make grammar the heart of the course, but it seems evident that the greatest progress in understanding and speaking was made when grammar was used only to explain and relate the materials of the conversational drill sessions. These sessions, when carefully planned and carried out, tried to reproduce natural life situations in which oral language serves its primary purpose of conveying information, ideas, and

emotions. The somewhat artificial pattern of "mim-mem" or similar devices, necessary at first, gradually made possible and yielded to more natural situations in which the dialogues were partly improvised, although still limited to a topical vocabulary, assigned and studied for the purpose. Songs and proverbs are easily acquired by their melody and rhythm; good phonograph records, with their unvarying repetition, also add to the student's basic repertory, which is the necessary fabric of true conversation. This basic repertory, instinctive and fluent and idiomatic, was rapidly acquired in the early weeks of the course, and the sense of achievement easily precluded boredom from the constant repetition. However, the drill-master had to be alert to sense the exact time for the change from memory work to improvisation; too early a change made the trainees discouraged at their inability to improvise; too late a change was preceded by boredom and apathy. The progress of some students was truly remarkable, and soon discouraged the others who could not keep up with them. After a few weeks, therefore, the superior students had their own drill sessions, while the others were regrouped at various levels, depending on how many students there were in the one language. Thus each student competed with his equals, and further regrouping at certain intervals served to reward the diligent.

As the weeks passed by, memory work gradually yielded to improvisation, with materials always thoroughly but unobtrusively planned and controlled by the senior instructor. The question-and-answer technique could now be applied to simple readings, but this soon became a rather languid business unless it was brief, the material lively, and the questioning preferably done by the students themselves. More thorough participation was achieved by studying a lively play, with "walking rehearsals" in class, followed by paraphrases, without the books. The well-nigh universal urge to act a rôle was capitalized in many other ways: students were provided with words and phrases to be used in a vivid scene or skit, such as French workers being hounded by Nazi foremen in a French factory; or a popular radio program was caricatured; or, more seriously, a military board questioned prisoners. Simple but interesting and mature games could be used, such as identifying a person or object without naming it, definitions and descriptions. Dictionaries might be required now, to aid in telling the day's headline news, and relating personal experiences. However, monologue easily developed at this point, and it was found that most progress was made when general vocal participation was involved. A projector made good use of maps and pictures, and the flash technique insures maximum attention. Motion pictures were also valuable at this intermediate stage, especially if students were provided with advance synopses and phrase lists, with the expectation that résumés and discussion would be required after the film was shown. Occasional intervals for relaxation served to heighten

attention, and a second showing of the film made possible true assimilation of the new material, both verbal and environmental.

In the later months there was almost no limit to the devices which the resourceful teachers used: impromptu dramatic situations or skits were now possible, within limits; "area" lectures in politics, economics, and other subjects; quick paraphrasing of sight material; guest speakers from the local community. Even speech contests were enthusiastically carried out. Especially valuable, however, as conducive to general participation, was free discussion on some current and highly controversial issue—politics, religion, morals, war guilt, etc. A little guiding or judicious heckling by the instructor kept the discussion general. As interest and blood pressure rose, inhibitions fell, and the language became vigorous, even eloquent. Interruptions, ejaculations, even a few authentic curses, added to the general spirit. When the drill session became a vigorous "bull session," then the conversational course was accomplishing its purpose.

The dilemma of fluency *versus* accuracy was always solved by compromise. The fastidious teacher, pained by the slightest mistake, frequently discouraged the beginning student's halting efforts, and even the advanced student's eager speech, by too frequent interruptions for correction. The careless teacher tended to "let anything go," provided it were fairly intelligible. A middle course was sought by the wise teacher, and it was generally agreed that fluency should be the primary objective in the early stages, but accuracy in the later. A fairly unobtrusive device was used by one young Frenchman: one upraised finger signalled a mistake in verb form; two fingers meant incorrect word order, and so on. Better still perhaps was the teacher who remained in the back of the room while discussion proceeded. He jotted down on a pad the important mistakes as they were made, and used the last few minutes of the period for correcting them before the class. Each speaker was then presented with the notations of his mistakes, as he left the room.

Throughout all this exposition it has doubtless been noticed that hearing and speaking have scarcely been distinguished. This is the natural and almost inevitable situation in life itself. There are, however, various devices for practice in hearing alone; the instructor-monologuist is the best known. There are others, frequently more interesting, but all somewhat ineffectual unless a quick verbal reaction is expected of the students; phonograph records (commercial series, OWI monitor records, records by drill-masters), all of which are enhanced by use of the printed text. Phonograph records of textbook material are especially valuable for home work, for they permit the student to take the drill-master home, as it were. Radio programs are frequently more topical than recordings, but the printed text is necessarily lacking. Records by students have a real value for purposes of testing at intervals, for they provide a means for the student to hear himself as others hear him.

A considerable variety of tape recorders gave an immediate playback, and proved to be good teaching devices. A telephone conversation, of which only one voice is heard, is a stimulating device also. But in general, mere hearing is only a partial and passive device; it rapidly loses effectiveness unless calculated to elicit a prompt vocal response.

The foregoing chronological presentation is misleading in that it seems to picture a gradual progression of all the students. The fact of the matter is that these activities, devices, and degrees of progress overlap considerably in that the most proficient and eager students steadily move ahead of the slower groups, with no time schedule or limit imposed by the program, the teacher, or a textbook. Indeed, this is one of the greatest merits of the new-type oral method as practised in the ASTP.

This fluid situation, and indeed the general emphasis on oral language, constitute at once the strength and the weakness of such a course. The possibilities of good teaching and good results are greatly increased, but by the same token the possibilities of slipshod work by the student, and charlatanism in the guise of teaching, are equally increased. In a few institutions the "oral method" was not distinguished from "hot air," and the results were dismal. The best results were obtained where experienced and constant supervision was exercised over the activities of trainees and teachers alike.

Examinations, similarly, have a very important rôle. Army experts and other specialists are still trying to devise objective tests of aural comprehension and oral fluency. Until these are provided the best tests have been found to be the standard devices: retelling or paraphrasing a spoken anecdote, situation, or description; impromptu responses to questions on familiar subjects; dictation; and, for comprehension only, written responses (true-false, or multiple-choice) to spoken phrases. The success of sectioning, and indeed the whole oral method, rests upon regular and reliable testing procedure.

Reading and Writing

Reading. While the main purpose of the ASTP was to teach trainees to speak and to understand the foreign languages they studied, they learned to read as well. This is attested by the large number of books widely used in class, the outside work reported on in class, and many papers, reviews, and other material produced by the trainees. To a very considerable degree even the classes in grammar were lessons in reading. Trainees also voluntarily read many books in the foreign language, selected from lists prepared by the teaching staff, though the amount of such reading varied. What is said above refers to trainees who began the language in ASTP. For those who had previous training there were groups which read one to two books per week in the foreign language.

Many classes in Russian were reading and translating in the first and second terms, while at least one class in the third term was reading and critically discussing Russian books. In the main, however, the Japanese, Chinese, and other Oriental and some Eastern European language classes were reading only the transcribed texts, and doing little or no reading of other material. Many tests and examinations were written or based on written questions, and in some cases a part of the examination was a translation of fairly difficult foreign material.

The point at which introduction of the written material took place varied in different institutions. Many began at once with texts written in normal orthography. This was usually the case in Western European languages. Most of the Oriental language classes began orally; only after one to six weeks was reading introduced, and then in romanized transcription. However, one class in Chinese began with the ideographs.

In the opinion of the teachers, the emphasis on speaking the language did not hinder, but rather helped, the reading. The ease and speed with which the trainees learned to read, and the amount they read, in ASTP abundantly confirm this opinion. The "area" which the trainees studied along with the foreign language dealt with the history, the geography, the economics, and, in general, the culture of the countries studied. The books dealing with this material were not graded for English-speaking students, but were written for the nationals of the various foreign countries. The ability of the trainees to read such material shows clearly a transfer from the ability to understand and speak to the ability to read.

Translation. In the above discussion "reading" has meant reading for the ideas in the text, not translating. There was considerable translation in the program. In the Oriental and Eastern European languages the text was almost always translated into English. At times, instead of translation a rephrasing of the idea in the foreign language was called for. At the time of our visits most of the classes were in the second or third term, and in the Western European language classes the drills in grammar sessions were usually conducted in the foreign language, although the trainee was requested to translate the passage if there was any doubt as to his comprehension of it. Thus translation was freely used in most classes when the limitations of time and the need for clarity seemed to demand it.

Writing. Writing was forbidden in some institutions and in many it was held to a minimum. However, many trainees desired to write. In numerous ASTP classes trainees were writing down the foreign phrases which they were supposed to learn orally. In one civilian class in which there was no text and where the language was to be learned orally, the teacher finally, in the third week, yielded to the trainees' demand and dictated phrases and sentences. In some

classes free composition was used. Dictation of sentences and even of paragraphs was used in various Western European language classes. An illustration of excellent dictation was in a Russian third-term class. A student was sent to the board and the teacher dictated a paragraph from a book unfamiliar to the class. The dictation was at normal speed and the writing was in Russian script. The few mistakes made by the student at the board were corrected, and in this manner correct forms were available to those who wrote at their seats. Another trainee went to the board, another paragraph was dictated, the corrections made, and so forth, until fifteen minutes had been spent in this exercise.

A poor dictation technique was the use of poorly selected and uninteresting material, dictated at such a slow speed that the instructor almost spelled the words for the trainees. There was no one at the board, and no immediate corrections were made. The trainees' papers were collected, corrected, and returned to the class next day. The trainees barely glanced at them; hence any possible benefits of the dictation were likely to be lost.

Grammar

Materials and Presentation. The oral objective set forth for the AST Language Program brought about a reappraisal of methods and materials for the presentation of grammar that had been used in earlier non-intensive language courses. The interest in introducing new procedures is evidenced by the fact that the three to five hours weekly devoted to grammatical explanations were seldom called "grammar sessions," but rather "structure," "analysis," "lecture," "demonstration," "theory," and "backbone" sessions. If those labels merely disguised or modified the familiar grammatical approach in many institutions, in an equal number of colleges not only modification but definite experimentation was tried. This experimentation involved the local preparation of a variety of materials and the oral presentation of these materials. Written material included frequency lists, topical vocabularies, model sentences involving grammatical points, substitution tables, and dictation exercises.

To a large extent, the amount of time spent on developing new materials varied with the rarity of the language to be taught. In the Oriental languages, a vast amount of individual written materials were prepared locally, as these were found to be unavailable elsewhere; and much imagination was embodied in them. In the common Western European languages, many of the standard commercial texts (especially those recently developed for war courses) were used, although generally with omissions and modifications.

Most teachers, and the most successful ones, conducted the grammar session as early as possible in the foreign language, some from the very first day. This practice caused the grammar session

in many units eventually to become identical in purpose with the drill session after the instructor had exhausted the body of grammar in the language, that is, after the first term. Accordingly, it was felt that a successful instructor should be almost as fluent in the language as the drill-master, if the drill-master were not to be present at the grammar hour. After the first term, however, some reading and translation were introduced into the grammar session, thus continuing to distinguish it in content from the drill session.

It early became apparent that in American foreign language departments there was no unanimity of opinion about the best way to present grammar, especially in teaching the Western European languages, for which many existing texts were brought into play which more or less prescribed the method and the vocabulary to be used. The most popular types of presentation in order of frequency were: use of conventional grammar texts, with modifications and increased use of foreign language; teaching of grammar by induction and analysis of carefully prepared drill sentences; structural analysis of dictated texts. Some instructors who adopted the latter two approaches suggested that the trainees buy review grammars to use for reference. In one Russian course, trainees drew upon reference materials in the library and constructed their own grammar under the guidance of their senior instructor. Others copied down grammatical rules and principles presented orally by the instructor during the course of the structural analysis of prepared texts.

While no single method of presentation was adopted universally, several tendencies were observed, apparently arrived at independently in widely separated institutions. Three of these basic tendencies were:

1. To speak the foreign language in class from the very first day.
2. To eliminate or postpone consideration of low-frequency constructions, tenses, moods, etc., in the interest of expediting efforts to speak.
3. To avoid translation from the foreign language into English.

In the courses visited, a conscious effort was required to exclude grammatical explanation from the drill sessions. It was often necessary to impress upon the students as well as the drill-master that explanations of grammatical phenomena, whether given in English or in the foreign language, belonged in the grammar session. Although a strict prohibition might have seemed unnecessarily authoritarian, it was generally felt that once the dike had been opened, more and more "grammar" had slipped through.

In order to avoid this possibility, many courses which were based on model sentences or texts first provided for explanation of these sentences in the grammar session and then introduced them into the drill sessions, to be repeated and then committed to mem-

ory. Sometimes the model texts were memorized before their grammatical content was explained. In other words, in most of these courses as well as in a few using a conventional grammar, the drill sessions were keyed to the subject of the grammar session. Although opinion was about evenly divided upon the utility of this, many of the most successful classes systematically keyed the materials of the drill session to the grammar class, even though this generally entailed more painstaking preparation. The instructors who did coordinate grammar and drill sessions were very emphatic about the utility and success of the scheme. It did have the additional advantage of keeping the drill-masters, many of them new to their task, within the prescribed limits of their duties. This was additionally important when the drill-masters did not attend the grammar session. In a great majority of cases, in fact, the drill-masters did not attend the grammar session.

In general it may be said that little new experimentation was carried on in the effort to test the trainee's acquisition of grammar. Only familiar devices were used in the grammar sessions (translation, dictation, true-false, etc.), with some emphasis laid on aural comprehension even here.

In the AST programs great claims were made upon the students' time. Although a few scattered instructors found that using the inductive method allowed them to require no outside preparation on the part of the student, the great majority of instructors interviewed, as well as most trainees, felt that some outside preparation was necessary to make the most advantageous use of the time spent in the grammar session. A smaller number felt that outside preparation was necessary for the drill sessions as well. Practically everyone agreed that this home preparation should be much less than that required in non-intensive courses. About one out of every ten institutions provided drill-masters or instructors to assist the trainees in their preparation during supervised study hours.

Practically all the instructors interviewed agreed that the proportion between grammar and drill practice established by the Army worked out very well, and that the relatively small portion of time allotted to formal presentation of grammar was sufficient.

Vocabulary. An almost unanimous reaction on the part of the language instructors was their characterization as inadequate of the familiar minimum vocabularies and frequency lists in the Western European languages. They felt that these were too often based upon literary contexts and had little place in an oral course emphasizing practicality of vocabulary. One German instructor complained that the word for "fork" was not found in one commonly-accepted 1000 word frequency list, although it was a word needed frequently by these trainees. As a substitute for these lists, many valuable home-made vocabulary lists were devised. "Composition of such a list is an art, not a science," explained one instructor.

Generally these were topical lists, centered upon every day needs and experiences, and forming a basis for conversation.

When an instructor used a conventional grammar, it was this grammar which prescribed the basic vocabulary to be learned in conjunction with the exercises in the text.

Many an instructor announced that he was becoming convinced of the undesirability of learning detached words in a list and that he was more successful in teaching words in short phrases or even in sentences.

In CATS courses, topical word lists and phrases were presented in technical manuals. Again, these topical lists stimulated conversation and provided words for model sentences illustrating grammatical points.

Supplementary Aids

In addition to the many new procedures adopted in class-room instruction, the AST language program was supplemented, to an extent which varied according to local facilities, by the use of mechanical apparatus and by the promotion of extra-curricular activities carried on in the foreign languages. These activities were perhaps no more intensely developed than in many colleges where, before the war, students had the advantages of language houses, language tables, language clubs, or the like. On the other hand, mechanical devices seem to have been put to wider use in the program than formerly, and therefore merit some description as they were observed in operation.

By far the most extensively used apparatus was the phonograph, for both listening and recording. Of these two procedures, listening to foreign language records was the more prevalent, because of the accessibility of commercially produced sets of records, available in any language desired, and usable with any phonograph. In many cases, such sets were individually owned by trainees and were utilized on a voluntary basis outside of class; in some cases listening was also done in class as a phase of routine instruction in pronunciation. Despite this use of commercial records, there was general agreement on the part of both instructors and students that records of this type were unsatisfactory for instructional purposes, especially in view of the lack of topical or textual connection between them and other course materials. More interesting in content, on the one hand, are transcriptions of short-wave broadcasts, March of Time recordings, or the like, which were used in one or two instances; more promising instructionally, on the other hand, are the recently devised G. I. records, some of which provide pauses, during which the student can repeat immediately the phrases spoken on the records. Such a device carries the student beyond mere passive listening, a rôle which, although it was considered to have some value when practised outside of class or during supervised study periods, was conceded to have little place in the

classroom, where it is difficult to see the advantage which a record holds over the voice of a native speaker present in the room.

In the several institutions where phonographic equipment included a recording machine, useful and stimulating work was accomplished. Drill-masters often cut their own records containing lesson materials used from day to day; these materials were then available for repeated aural review, either optional or obligatory. In one institution, several hundred trainees listened from three to four hours a week, *en masse*, to recordings of course materials in an Oriental language, with corresponding romanized texts before their eyes. In other cases, native drill-masters had recorded supplementary passages for paraphrase or summarization by the students.

An even more effective process was that of recording by the student himself. Individual trainees made records of their own speech in the foreign language, at intervals ranging from once per term to every two weeks, and, in at least one instance, the material recorded consisted of dialogues between student and drill-master, prepared the first time, unrehearsed thereafter. The unique experience of hearing one's own voice as others hear it can be so effectively exploited for diagnosis of speech faults that improvement in pronunciation is often measurable. To achieve maximum effectiveness, however, first-class acoustical conditions, and high-grade recording machines and disks are indispensable. Excellent for remedial purposes is a magnetic tape recorder, which was in use in at least a half-dozen units. This apparatus, capable of immediately reproducing, on magnetized tape, short utterances, which can as quickly be erased, provides an opportunity for speedy analysis and offers advantages over the more cumbersome process of disk-cutting. While the utility of such devices cannot be denied, enthusiasm for technology has perhaps been carried a step too far in the use of the cathode-ray oscilloscope, which, despite its impressive label, is incapable of demonstrating more than one sound at a time. Its place would seem to be in the research laboratory rather than the elementary language classroom.

Of the radio and telephone, little use was observed. In one instance certain students, weak on comprehension, were periodically required as an exercise to take foreign language messages over the telephone; but in no observed case was the vast resource of foreign language broadcasts, accessible over short-wave radio, being utilized.

In addition to phonographic and allied devices, a widely used aid was the foreign language moving picture, mainly in the form of commercial films. Occasionally, OWI or War Department propaganda releases were accessible. Despite the wide use of commercial films, there was rather general dissatisfaction with those available for showing at the units; many of these films were acoustically defective, so that comprehension was difficult. Consequently, there was considerable feeling that, from the point

of view of instruction, returns from these poor-grade, antiquated movies were very slight, and little effort was therefore made to integrate their use with the teaching program. In most cases such films were shown outside of contact hours, and were frankly regarded as extra-curricular, although often they served as incidental topics of discussion in subsequent drill sessions. Exceptional, though certainly commendable, was the procedure of one enterprising instructor who provided the spectators with synopses in advance, and at twenty-minute intervals had the film stopped for five minutes to permit questions. The next day's drill session was devoted to discussion of the film, and if it seemed advisable the showing was repeated once or even twice. One other highly successful adaptation of talkies to drill work was observed in an institution where excellent 35 mm. films were first shown in the afternoon, and, after a drill session in which the film provided the subject of conversation, a second showing was held in the evening. In general, it was agreed that movies were theoretically a useful aid, but only in so far as good ones could be obtained and profitably integrated with the program. Furthermore, they required optimum acoustical and technical conditions for showing if satisfactory results were to be attained.

As regards wholly extra-curricular activities in the foreign language, a wide variety of practices was observed. Students often were privileged to hear visiting lecturers speaking foreign tongues, and in some cases much energy was devoted to arranging lecture programs for the special benefit of the language trainees. Nearly everywhere informal *soirées* were held in the homes of staff members or of local residents who spoke the language. In communities where national groups had active clubs or organizations (such as the Alliance Française or the Deutscher Verein), appropriate contacts were made and the trainees were included in many of their activities. In many cities, it was possible to take students to foreign language restaurants, cinemas, and church services. Where the college had civilian student language clubs, the Army trainees were invited to participate in the meetings and were encouraged to present dramatic skits. The staging of original playlets was widespread among trainee groups, and in a few units more ambitious dramatic presentations were undertaken with outstanding success. In several institutions, students edited their own monthly newspapers, in mimeographed form, as for example the *G. I. Allerlei* or *Il Pugnolo.* In many units, singing was especially popular, and at some colleges each language group devoted a special hour once a week to an organized singing session, at which songs were learned by heart and where the eventual performance, especially in Russian, was most impressive.

There were several attempts to establish "language tables"; that is, dining tables where only the foreign language was used. These attempts met with varying success: considerable in a group

where the teaching staff attended several luncheons per week, but little where attendance was optional or where there was no supervision. In a number of units, it was possible actually to quarter the trainees by language groups, an arrangement which inevitably stimulated additional use of the language.

In general, all such extra-curricular activities as are described above were felt to have been amply justified, by reason of their function as normal outlets for self-expression in the foreign tongue, and their close approach to the all-important vital experience of "living the language," unequalled in even the most cleverly stimulated classroom exercises of the traditional sort.

Results Achieved in the ASTP

As stated above, the purpose of the intensive AST Language Program was to give the trainees command of the colloquial spoken form of a foreign language. This involved fluency and reasonable accuracy in speaking, a pronunciation acceptable from the standpoint of the average native listener, and ability to understand the spoken language when heard under natural conditions.

For the purpose of this report the results of language teaching in the ASTP may be considered fairly only for those trainees who had had no previous recognizable experience in hearing or speaking the foreign language which they were studying.

Regarding the achievements of the trainees on this basis, the survey staff found that for a very considerable number of trainees the results, while by no means miraculous, were definitely good, very satisfactory to the men in charge of the program, and very generally gratifying to the trainees themselves. Wherever the staff found careful and appropriate organization and coordination of teaching procedures, capable senior instructors and drill-masters, adequate supervision and control of the work, and skill and resourcefulness in the construction and adaptation of teaching materials, encouraging and worthwhile results were achieved. In short, a considerable percent of the trainees did acquire the ability to express themselves with fluency and reasonable accuracy in the foreign language which they were speaking for the first time, including a good pronunciation, and a high level of ability to understand the spoken language as employed by different native speakers under circumstances representing normal speaking conditions.

There is considerable evidence, too, that the consistent and intensive use of the oral approach by no means eliminated the opportunity to acquire reading ability. In view of the great amount and variety of printed materials actually used by the trainees in preparing for oral practice of one kind or another, as well as for extra-curricular and purely recreational purposes, silent reading

ability, while it was not an announced objective of the program, undoubtedly was generally acquired to a very appreciable extent. This impression on the part of the survey staff was supported quite generally by the university men in charge of the language programs at the institutions visited, as well as by deans and faculty members from other departments.

Glossary

ASTP. Army Specialized Training Program. (The Foreign Area and Language Study Curriculum was only one of several programs included in the ASTP.)

CATS. Civil Affairs Training Schools, set up by the Civil Affairs Division, Provost Marshal General's Office.

Coordinator. A civilian member of the college faculty, usually an administrative officer of the college. His duties were to interpret and implement the Army's requirements. In short, a kind of civilian liaison officer between the Army and the college faculty.

Drill-master; Informant; Native Speaker. Normally a foreign-born person, sometimes an American-born person, with complete oral control of the foreign language. Usually not a faculty member, but chosen to give trainees practice in hearing and speaking the foreign language in drill sessions.

Drill Session; Mimicry-memory ("mim-mem"); Conversation Period. A period devoted to practice in the comprehension and imitation of the drill-master's speech, and to conversational practice. In the ASTP, ten to twelve hours per week were devoted to such work.

FALSC. Foreign Area and Language Study Curriculum. A program of studies devoted to: (a) the colloquial language of a country or region; (b) the geography, history, politics, economics, and *mores* of that region and adjacent regions. Sixty per cent of the trainees' time was allotted to (a) and forty per cent to (b).

Grammar Period; Lecture; Demonstration; Interpretation and Analysis ("I. A."). A period devoted to the study of grammar and syntax. Local variations of approach to this study are approximately indicated by the various terms. Five hours per week were allotted to this work at first; later only three.

Oral Method; Oral Approach. In general, these terms refer to the techniques which aimed to develop oral-aural skills primarily, and which therefore used grammar, reading, and writing only to the extent that they helped the trainee to comprehend and to speak.

Senior Instructor; Course Director. Normally, an American-born, experienced college teacher of foreign languages. It was his duty to choose and organize the materials of the course, plan the curriculum, instruct and supervise the drill-masters, give the trainees their instruction in language structure, supervise examinations, and report to the Coordinator on the achievement of the trainees.

STAR Unit. Selection, Training, and Replacement Unit. Provided facilities for selection and assignment to the various curricula of the ASTP, as well as temporary training, usually for a period not exceeding thirty days.

NOTE. In the following pages the members of the Survey Group present:

(1) their summary of the opinions expressed to them by instructors, directors, and others as to the applicability of the ASTP methods to civilian teaching;

(2) their own conclusions and recommendations growing out of their observation and experience of ASTP language classes, including applications to school instruction and teacher training.

What they have to say deserves careful consideration, because they have had broader and at the same time more intimate contact with the program than any other group.

The Commission on Trends in Education is giving thoughtful attention to their recommendations, together with other materials submitted to it. A report embodying the recommendations of the Commission, entitled *Foreign Languages and Tomorrow,* is in preparation.

The Commission on Trends in Education of The Modern Language Association of America wishes to make clear that the opinions expressed in the foregoing report, and the recommendations that follow, are those of the Survey Group. They are published at this time in order to bring them without delay to the attention of those concerned with the teaching of modern foreign languages.

HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE, *Chairman.*

Recommendations

(See the Note on page 27)

1. *Generally Expressed Opinions of Administrators, Course Directors, and Instructors*

After questioning administrators, course directors, and instructors in institutions where the language curriculum of the ASTP was in operation, the Survey Group noted wide agreement that certain principles and elements of this curriculum could fruitfully be introduced into post-war language teaching for civilians at the college level. Those interviewed agreed that certain objectives of ASTP language training, admittedly designed to fill practical military needs, would naturally be abandoned; and they reaffirmed their belief that the understanding and appreciation of foreign cultures is a primary aim of language study in a liberal education. Their experience with the achievements of the ASTP language curriculum had convinced them, however, that the acquisition of all-round language proficiency, including the ability to read, involves a command of the spoken form of the language as an initial objective. In recognition of this principle, they were ready to recommend, in so far as might be practicable, adoption of an intensive plan of language instruction, to include the following elements:

1. A large number of contact hours per week, of which a lesser number would be devoted to grammar work, and a greater number to conversational drill work.
2. Very small classes (ten students or less) for drill work, sectioned according to the ability and progress of the individual students.
3. Some outside preparation by the student for grammar classes, though less than in non-intensive courses; little or no outside preparation for drill sessions.
4. The use of native, or completely bilingual, speakers for drill work.
5. The use of supplementary aids, including mechanical apparatus such as motion pictures, phonograph records, recording machines, magnetic-tape recorders, radio, and telephone.
6. The provision of a living background for the study of the language, through extra-curricular activities, such as language houses, language tables, and language clubs within the institution, as well as social contacts with foreign-language groups in the community.

In order to implement such a program of language study, it was felt that certain types of teaching materials, at present not generally available, are needed. These include:

1. New textual materials specially designed for use in intensive courses, such as:
   a) Elementary grammars which avoid technical terms, place less emphasis on translation, and present graded structural material keyed to drill work in conversation.
   b) More collections of reading materials, suitable for use at the intermediate level, representing various aspects of the foreign culture concerned, calculated to satisfy students' special intellectual interests and provided with ample exercises to aid oral discussion.
   c) More adequate word-lists, of which some would be topically arranged.
2. More mechanical apparatus, in the nature of audio-visual aids, at reasonable cost, including:
   a) Records specially designed to teach pronunciation, and albums of records incorporating the drill material of the textbooks.
   b) Efficient recording machines.
   c) Magnetic-tape recorders.
   d) Moving pictures designed to be integrated with instruction in the language.
3. New devices and methods for objectively testing aural and oral proficiency.

2. *Recommendations of the Survey Group*

There was complete agreement among all who participated in the Army language program—teachers and trainees alike—that the general success achieved was due first and foremost to its intensive character. A language course pursued through three twelve-week terms of fifteen contact hours per week under proper supervision did produce noteworthy results. These have been described in detail in the foregoing Report, and only the following primary results need to be indicated:

1. The student after nine months had learned to understand the language as spoken by natives on a variety of subjects.
2. He was able to speak intelligibly on a wide range of subjects.
3. He was able to read the (European) language with considerable facility.
4. He was able to write the (European) language with reasonable skill.

On the basis of the evidence at its disposal the Survey Group wholeheartedly recommends the adoption of intensive courses in beginning language instruction. In the opinion of the Group, the ideal intensive course would consist of fifteen contact hours—not credit hours—weekly. The student electing an intensive course would use up no more units or credit hours for language study than before. To a large extent the time formerly used for outside study would be spent in drill work under the supervision of a native or a bilingual speaker.

The program of fifteen contact hours could, of course, be put into operation more easily under some college schedules than under others. For example, in colleges operating on a sixteen-week term, where five three-hour courses constitute a full schedule, the intensive course might function somewhat as follows. The student elects to take two units of a language during each of two terms, this to be considered the intensive course. At the end of the intensive course (that is, after two terms) he will have satisfied a two-year language requirement. After its completion he may elect a regular course offered by the language department concerned if he wishes, but such a course will not be part of the two-year requirement. In fact, of the courses offered by the language department only one would have to be intensive in nature, though others might be.

Under some college schedules such a program would not be practical or desirable; e.g., where three five-hour courses constitute a full schedule, two-thirds of a student's time for a whole year would have to be devoted to the learning of one language. For these colleges, instead of an intensive course of fifteen contact hours per week, the Survey Group would recommend (1) that the present number of class hours in beginning language courses be at least doubled, without additional credit given but with a far greater part of the student's time spent in drill sessions instead of outside study; and (2) that this "intensified" course be continued until the approximate number of contact hours prescribed in the Army program is reached. Naturally, the number of contact hours per week will be smaller, and it may be that the results will be proportionately less satisfactory. Yet, inasmuch as every other feature of the Army intensive course is embodied here also, it seems reasonable to conclude that the results will prove to be better than those achieved in a traditional course pursued for two years.

The degree of intensification possible in the various colleges depends upon the length of term, the number of credits and hours per course, etc., making it impossible to attempt to outline an intensive language course which could be adopted in all institutions. The Survey Group believes that many experiments will be made before each college decides what type of elementary language course is best suited to its purposes. In making this recommendation the Survey Group merely wishes to emphasize the fact that

the Army program achieved excellent results. To achieve comparable results a program similar to it in basic design would seem to be called for.

In addition to the main general recommendation, the Survey Group submits the following specific suggestions:

1. The general ratio of grammar to drill followed in the Army program should be retained in the intensive language course in colleges.
2. The intensive course or its equivalent should be required of all foreign language majors.
3. The intensive course should be optional for all other students.
4. Non-intensive elementary language courses should continue to be available to students not wishing to elect the intensive course.
5. The supervising instructor should be in full charge of the intensive course, in order to insure proper organization of materials, complete coordination between grammar-study and drill sections, close supervision and control of drill sessions, and reliable evaluation of the work of drill-masters.
6. Participation in intensive courses should be undertaken only by teachers who are qualified and willing. The drill-master, if a qualified teacher is not already available, should be an educated native or bilingual speaker; his position in the university or college should be that of a visiting teacher or exchange fellow; he should normally serve two years as drill-master, and his maximum teaching load should be not more than twenty hours per week. He should receive preliminary training before being entrusted with drill work.
7. To insure continued interest and motivation, the material presented in the drill session during the later stages of the course should be closely allied to the student's major field of interest: for example, literature, music, foreign politics, economics, history, etc.
8. During the second half of the course the grammar sessions should be used further to develop the student's reading ability.
9. A central clearing house for information and consultation should be established, with the approval of the various organizations which sponsored the present survey. Such a clearing house would be operated by a group of representative foreign-language teachers. Its functions would be:
   a. To gather information concerning recent and prospective courses in the new-type language teaching.

b. To make this information available to interested administrators, colleagues, and, under proper authorization, to the press.

c. To consult and advise with institutions which seek its counsel concerning the establishing of new-type language courses.

d. To keep a record of further experimentation in such instruction, and of testing procedures.

e. To consult with those institutions planning to train or retrain teachers who will use the new-type instruction.

f. To encourage further study and research not only at the center of this new field, but also at various points of its ill-defined periphery in adjacent fields (speech and hearing, films, tests and measurements, psychology, history, political science, etc.).

g. To keep available a list of drill-masters in the various languages with such information about each as might be desired by institutions needing native speakers.

h. To prepare and publish a fairly complete history of recent developments.

10. Teachers in intensive language courses should be granted brief leaves of absence, with pay, in order to permit them to visit and observe intensive classes in other institutions.

Application of ASTP Experience to Language Teaching in Secondary and Elementary Schools

Most of the many commendable features found in the ASTP language curriculum can be adapted, we believe, to the teaching of modern foreign languages in the secondary and elementary schools. These features are: a careful initial selection and classification of pupils on the basis of their ability to learn; an audio-oral approach to the study of a foreign language; increased amount of time devoted to in-school practice in the use of the language; emphasis on colloquial language dealing with actual current life situations; small classes or practice groups supervised by teachers who really speak the foreign language; correlation of language and area study; suitable teaching materials; development and appropriate use of adequate audio-visual equipment; and utilization of all school and community resources in providing opportunities for the maximum possible amount of practice in the use of the language during the learning process.

Because of the already crowded curriculum and the difficulty of scheduling additional contact hours in junior and senior high schools, where the schools are organized on a departmental basis,

the chief problems, aside from the increased cost of instruction and the shortage of adequately prepared teachers, will be to find time for additional classroom practice in the use of the foreign language and to effect arrangements whereby practice groups may be limited in size to a number far below the usual thirty or more pupils now found in conventional high-school classes. In spite of these problems, however, it should be possible to increase substantially, or even to double, the five forty-minute-period course (3⅓ clock hours per week) now generally offered in high schools. Extra laboratory hours, or even double periods, are not unusual in other subject-field areas, where a great deal of in-school supervised practice is considered necessary. The extra contact time may well take the place of part or all of the home study now expected in the traditional situation. In schools where native-speaking pupils are present in the student body these pupils may be used advantageously in helping to provide opportunities for practice in the language.

In the typical high school the disadvantages inherent in the more or less standard thirty-pupil group may be met to a certain extent by dividing the class into several smaller groups for partly self-motivated activities conducted under the supervision of the teacher within the class period. This was sometimes done even in the small classes found in the ASTP, and is now regularly done in high-school classes in science and other subjects.

While the audio-oral approach to language learning is recommended for high schools, it goes almost without saying that it is the only approach that *can* be used successfully in the elementary school. The limited range of the younger pupils' experience will probably restrict the work of the elementary-school teacher to the practical colloquial language of everyday life. Otherwise, the necessary motivation will be lacking and there will be no progress.

For elementary-school pupils who may study a foreign language, it should be fairly easy to provide as much time over a period of years as may be required to develop a high degree of fluency within the limits of the vocabulary usable at this school level.

While elementary-school classes are as a rule even larger than high-school classes, the practice of dividing the class into relatively small groups for work on special projects is an established procedure. Such grouping for foreign language activities would be entirely feasible.

The ever-expanding use of audio-visual equipment, especially in the lower schools, may readily bring about use of special equipment, if and when it becomes available in adequate form and quantity, for the audio-visual teaching of foreign languages to younger pupils.

Since grammar as such will not be studied separately in the lower schools, it is believed that the ASTP practice of dividing

contact hours into separate grammar and drill sessions will be neither necessary nor desirable.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that expert organization and supervision of foreign-language teaching in the lower schools is the *sine qua non* of success in any foreign-language program.

Teacher Training

If we plan to extend the oral approach to foreign language teaching, more adequate training must be provided for and required of our teachers, both as pre-service and as in-service training.

In some localities, the preparation in a foreign language now required for certification to teach it is as little as twelve semester hours of traditional college instruction, of which six may be met by presenting two years of high-school work. Such preparation, if it is all that the teacher has, is obviously inadequate.

It is not necessarily a reflection upon foreign language teachers that many of them do not command the spoken language sufficiently well to enable them to employ an oral approach, as was done in the ASTP language curriculum. In many instances, undoubtedly, there has been neither the incentive nor the opportunity for them to acquire the needed facility in the foreign language which they are called upon to teach. The intensive courses provide the incentive. To apply the oral approach, the teacher must be able to speak the foreign language, and institutions exist in which teachers may be adequately prepared to do so.

If the intensified language program, with its use of the oral approach, is to succeed it cannot be too strongly impressed on school administrators that they must insist on teachers who are qualified.

Teacher-training institutions will have to train such qualified teachers to employ the methods which must be used if the oral approach is to be applied successfully. This training will certainly have to produce a satisfactory degree of proficiency in understanding and speaking the colloquial form of the foreign language. No teacher should be certified to teach a foreign language who does not pass an examination in aural and oral proficiency in the language which he plans to teach.

Observation of the methods and techniques employed in successful intensive language teaching should be a part of the teacher-training program. Such a program should also include careful training in the sources, evaluation, development and use of textbooks and other teaching materials.